

On a property of plane curves

Mohammad Javaheri
Department of Mathematics
Trinity College
Hartford, CT 06106

Email: *Mohammad.Javaheri@trincoll.edu*

May 8, 2009

Abstract

Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ be a continuous curve such that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$, $\gamma(1) = (1, 1)$, and $\gamma(t) \in (0, 1)^2$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. We prove that, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequence of points A_i , $0 \leq i \leq n+1$, on γ such that $A_0 = (0, 0)$, $A_{n+1} = (1, 1)$, and the sequences $\pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}})$ and $\pi_2(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}})$, $0 \leq i \leq n$, are positive and the same up to order, where π_1, π_2 are projections on the axes.

1 Introduction

Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ be a continuous curve such that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0) = O$ and $\gamma(1) = (1, 1) = D$. Then γ needs to intersect, say at a point A , with the diagonal segment connecting the points $(0, 1)$ and $(1, 0)$. The vectors $\overrightarrow{OA}$ and $\overrightarrow{AD}$ relate to each other in the following way:

$$\pi_1(\overrightarrow{OA}) = \pi_2(\overrightarrow{AD}) , \quad \pi_2(\overrightarrow{OA}) = \pi_1(\overrightarrow{AD}) , \quad (1.1)$$

where π_1 and π_2 are the projections, respectively, on the x -axis and the y -axis. We are interested in generalizing this geometric observation. We shall prove the following theorem in §3.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ be a continuous curve such that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$, $\gamma(1) = (1, 1)$, and $\gamma(t) \in (0, 1)^2$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequence of points A_i on the curve γ , $i = 0, \dots, n+1$, such that $A_0 = (0, 0)$, $A_{n+1} = (1, 1)$, and the two sequences*

$$\pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}}) > 0 , \quad i = 0, \dots, n , \quad (1.2)$$

and

$$\pi_2(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}}) > 0 , \quad i = 0, \dots, n , \quad (1.3)$$

are the same after a rearrangement.

The graph case. To motivate the problem better, we first prove Theorem 1.1 when γ is the graph of a function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (see Corollary 3.1 below). First, we need a lemma.

Lemma 1.2. *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $f(0) = 0$, $f(1) = 1$, and $f(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an increasing sequence $x_i \in (0, 1)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that*

$$f(x_{i+1}) - f(x_i) = x_i - x_{i-1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq n. \quad (1.4)$$

Here $x_{-1} = x_n - 1$, $x_0 = 0$, and $x_{n+1} = 1$.

Proof. Define a sequence of functions recursively by

$$g_0(x) = x, \quad g_{i+1}(x) = x - 1 + f(g_i(x)), \quad i \geq 1. \quad (1.5)$$

Clearly g_1 is well-defined on $[0, 1]$. Since $g_1(0) = -1 < 1 = g_1(1)$, the Intermediate-value theorem [1] implies that g_1 is zero somewhere on the interval $(0, 1)$. Let $a_1 \in (0, 1)$ be the largest root of g_1 . Now g_2 is well-defined on $[a_1, 1]$ with $g_2(a_1) = a_1 - 1 + f(g_1(a_1)) = a_1 - 1 < 0$ and $g_2(1) = 1 > 0$. The Intermediate-value theorem implies that g_2 has roots in the interval $(a_2, 1)$, and we define a_2 to be the largest root of g_2 . By continuing in this fashion, one defines an increasing sequence $a_i \in (0, 1)$ such that g_{i+1} is defined and continuous on the interval $(a_i, 1)$ with $g_i(a_i) = 0$ and $g_i(1) = 1$.

Now let n be a fixed positive integer and define a sequence $x_i \in (0, 1)$ by setting:

$$x_0 = 0, \quad x_{n+1} = 1; \quad x_i = g_{n-i}(a_n), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n. \quad (1.6)$$

It is straightforward to verify that the equations (1.4) hold for the above choice of x_i 's.

It is left to show that the sequence x_i is increasing. One has:

$$x_i = g_{n-i}(a_n) = a_n - 1 + f(x_{i+1}) < x_{i+1}, \quad (1.7)$$

since $f(x) \leq x$ for all $x \in [0, 1]$ and $a_n < 1$. $\square$

Corollary 1.3. *Let $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function such that $f(0) = 0$ and $f(1) = 1$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds for the curve $\gamma(t) = (t, f(t))$.*

Proof. Let $F \subset [0, 1]$ be the set of $x \in (0, 1)$ such that $f(x) = x$. If F is an infinite set, then the statement of this corollary is trivial. The case that F is non-empty can be reduced to the case that F is empty. And without loss of generality, one can also assume that $f(x) \leq x$ for all x . Then the statement follows from Lemma 1.2. $\square$

2 Mountain Climbers' Problem

To prove Theorem 1.1, we need a modification of the standard Mountain Climbers' problem. The Mountain Climbers' problem asks for a way for each of the climbers on two sides of a mountain to travel to the top of the mountain such that they both stay at the same level at all times. Mathematically, one has the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. [2] *Let $f_1, f_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be locally non-constant continuous functions with $f_1(0) = f_2(0) = 0$, $f_1(1) = f_2(1) = 1$. Then there are functions g_1, g_2 with the same properties such that $f_1 \circ g_1 = f_2 \circ g_2$.*

Here, we say f is locally non-constant, if there is no interval on which f is constant. We will need to replace the condition that both functions are locally non-constant with a stronger condition on one of the functions.

We call a function $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *piecewise monotone*, if there is a partition of $[0, 1]$ to a finite number of subintervals on each of which f is strictly increasing or strictly decreasing.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the set of piecewise monotone continuous functions $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with the property that, for any $c \in [0, 1]$, the set $f^{-1}(c)$ does not contain a local maximum and a local minimum of f at the same time.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $f_1, f_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be continuous functions such that $f_1(0) = f_2(0) = 0$ and $f_1(1) = f_2(1) = 1$. If $f_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, then the Mountain Climbers' problem has a solution for f_1 and f_2 , i.e. there exist continuous functions $g_1, g_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $g_1(0) = g_2(0) = 0$, $g_1(1) = g_2(1) = 1$, and $f_1 \circ g_1 = f_2 \circ g_2$.*

Proof. If f_2 is also locally non-constant, then the result follows from Theorem 2.1. Thus, suppose f_2 is constant on a collection of mutually disjoint intervals $I_\alpha = [a_\alpha, b_\alpha]$, $\alpha \in J$, where J is a finite or countable set. Let $f_2(I_\alpha) = \{c_\alpha\}$. Since $f_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, the set

$$\Lambda_\alpha = f_1^{-1}(\{c_\alpha\}) \quad (2.1)$$

is finite. We define a locally non-constant function f_3 as follows. On the complement of $\cup_\alpha I_\alpha$, we let $f_3 = f_2$. To define f_3 on I_α , choose $d_\alpha > 0$ so that f_1 has no local max or min values in the interval $[c_\alpha - d_\alpha, c_\alpha + d_\alpha]$ except possibly c_α itself. We define f_3 on I_α by setting:

$$f_3(x) = c_\alpha \pm \frac{4d_\alpha}{(b_\alpha - a_\alpha)}(x - a_\alpha)(x - b_\alpha) . \quad (2.2)$$

Here the plus sign is chosen if Λ_α contains no minimums, and the minus sign is chose otherwise. Note that f_3 is a continuous locally non-constant function on $[0, 1]$.

Since f_1 and f_3 satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2.1, we conclude that there are functions $h, k : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $f_1 \circ h = f_3 \circ k$. Let

$$k^{-1}(a_\alpha, b_\alpha) = \bigcup_{\beta \in S_\alpha^\beta} (u_\alpha^\beta, v_\alpha^\beta) , \quad (2.3)$$

where S_α^β is some index set (at most countable) and the intervals $J_\alpha^\beta = (u_\alpha^\beta, v_\alpha^\beta)$, $\beta \in S_\alpha^\beta$, are pairwise disjoint. We show that $h(u_\alpha^\beta) = h(v_\alpha^\beta)$. We have

$$f_1 \circ h(u_\alpha^\beta) = f_3 \circ k(u_\alpha^\beta) = c_\alpha = f_3 \circ k(v_\alpha^\beta) = f_1 \circ h(v_\alpha^\beta) . \quad (2.4)$$

It follows that $h(u_\alpha^\beta), h(v_\alpha^\beta) \in f_1^{-1}(\{c_\alpha\}) = \Lambda_\alpha$. If $h(u_\alpha^\beta) \neq h(v_\alpha^\beta)$, then there must exist $t_0 \in J_\alpha^\beta$ such that $f_1 \circ h(t_0)$ is a maximum or minimum value for f_1 and $f_1 \circ h(t_0) \neq c_\alpha$. By the definition of d_α , it follows that $|f_1 \circ h(t_0) - c_\alpha| > d_\alpha$. On the other hand, $k(t_0) \in (a_\alpha, b_\alpha)$, and so

$$|f_1 \circ h(t_0) - c_\alpha| = |f_3 \circ k(t_0) - c_\alpha| \leq d_\alpha . \quad (2.5)$$

This is a contradiction, and so $h(u_\alpha^\beta) = h(v_\alpha^\beta)$.

Next, we define g_1 by setting:

$$g_1(t) = \begin{cases} h(t) & t \notin \cup_{\alpha, \beta} J_\alpha^\beta , \\ h(u_\alpha^\beta) = h(v_\alpha^\beta) & \exists \alpha \in J, \beta \in J_\alpha^\beta : t \in J_\alpha^\beta , \end{cases}$$

and let $g_2 = k$. Then g_1 and g_2 are continuous functions, $g_1(0) = g_2(0) = 0$, $g_1(1) = g_2(1) = 1$, and $f_1 \circ g_1 = f_2 \circ g_2$. $\square$

3 Partitioning functions and points

In this section, we consider a special class of curves, namely the class $\mathcal{C}$ of curves $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ with $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$, $\gamma(1) = (1, 1)$, and $\pi_2 \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{U}$. Similar statements for more general curves will be proved in §3 by taking limits.

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist continuous functions $y, x_i : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, such that:*

- i) $(x_i(t), x_{i-1}(t) + y(t)) \in \gamma, \forall i = 1, \dots, n$, where $x_0(t) = 0$.
- ii) $x_i(0) = y(0) = 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, n$.
- iii) $(x_n(1), x_{n-1}(1) + y(1)) = (1, 1)$.

We call the set of functions $x_i, i = 1, \dots, n+1$, a set of partitioning functions for γ .

Proof. Proof is by induction on n . For $n = 1$, one takes $x_1(t) = \pi_1 \circ \gamma(t)$ and $y(t) = \pi_2 \circ \gamma(t)$. Suppose there exist functions $u_1, \dots, u_n$, and $v(t)$ that satisfy *i-iii*. Let t_0 be the smallest t for which $u_n(t) + v(t) = 1$ (and so $t_0 > 0$ and possibly $t_0 = 1$). We define two functions f_1, f_2 by setting

$$f_1(t) = \pi_2 \circ \gamma(t) , \quad f_2(t) = u_n(t_0 t) + v(t_0 t) , \quad t \in [0, 1] . \quad (3.1)$$

Functions f_1, f_2 satisfy all of the conditions of Theorem 2.2. It follows that there are continuous functions g_1, g_2 such that $f_1 \circ g_1 = f_2 \circ g_2$. Let's define:

$$y(t) = v(t_0 g_2(t)) ; \quad x_i(t) = u_i(t_0 g_2(t)) , \quad \forall i \leq n ; \quad x_{n+1}(t) = \pi_1 \circ \gamma \circ g_1(t) . \quad (3.2)$$

It is straightforward to check that conditions *i-iii* are satisfied by the above set of functions. $\square$

In the next Proposition, $\Delta = \{(a, b) \in (0, 1)^2 : a > b\}$.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a sequence of points A_i , $i \leq n+1$, on the curve so that*

$$\pi_2(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}}) = \pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_{i-1} A_i}) , \quad i = 0, \dots, n+1 , \quad (3.3)$$

where $A_{-1} = A_{n+1} - (1, 1)$, $A_0 = (0, 0)$, and $A_{n+2} = (1, 1)$. Moreover, if $\gamma(t) \in \Delta$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$, then the A_i 's can be chosen to be distinct.

Proof. Recall from Proposition 3.1 that there are partitioning functions y, x_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, satisfying conditions *i-iii*. Define a continuous curve $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ by setting

$$\eta(t) = (1 - y(t), x_n(t) + y(t)) . \quad (3.4)$$

We will show that η and γ intersect. First, we show that $y(1) > 0$. Otherwise, $x_{n-1}(1) = 1$ and a little induction implies that $x_i(1) = 1$ for all $i \geq 1$. It would follow that $(1, 0) = (x_1(1), y(1)) \in \gamma$ which is a contradiction.

Next, we note that $\eta(0) = (1, 0)$ while $\eta(1) = (1 - y(1), 1 + y(1))$. Since $\pi_1 \circ \eta(t) \in [0, 1]$, it follows that η and γ intersect at a point $A_{n+1} = \eta(t_0) = (1 - y(t_0), x_n(t_0) + y(t_0))$, where $t_0 \in [0, 1]$. We then define $A_i = (x_i(t_0), x_{i-1}(t_0) + y(t_0))$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. It is then straightforward to check that the A_i 's, $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ satisfy the relations (3.3).

Next suppose that $\gamma(t) \in \Delta$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Then, we have $A_i \in (0, 1)^2$ for $i \neq 0, n+2$. To see this, suppose $A_i = (x_i(t_0), x_{i-1}(t_0) + y(t_0)) = (0, 0)$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then $y(t_0) = 0 = x_i(t_0)$ for all $i = 0, \dots, n$. But then $\eta(t_0) = (1, 0) \notin \gamma$ which is a contradiction. If $A_{n+1} = \eta(t_0) = (0, 0)$, then $y(t_0) = 1$ and $x_n(t_0) = 0$. But then $A_n = (x_n(t_0), x_{n-1}(t_0) + y(t_0)) = (0, x_{n-1}(t_0) + 1) \in \gamma$ which is again a contradiction. Similar arguments show that $A_i \neq (1, 1)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n+1$. Now, since γ is contained in Δ for $t \in (0, 1)$, we have $\pi_2(A_i) < \pi_1(A_i)$ for all $i \neq 0, n+2$. In particular, we have

$$\pi_1(A_i) - \pi_1(A_{i-1}) = \pi_1(A_i) - \pi_2(A_i) + y(t_0) , \quad (3.5)$$

which is positive for $i = 1, \dots, n+1$. It follows that the sequence $\pi_1(A_i)$, $i = 0, \dots, n+2$, is a strictly increasing sequence. In particular, the A_i 's are all distinct. $\square$

Proposition 3.2 implies Theorem 1.1, if $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\gamma(t) \in \Delta$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. In fact, it states a stronger result, namely the sequences (1.2) and (1.3) are the same up to a shift permutation. This conclusion motivates the following conjecture.

Conjecture. Suppose $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ is a continuous curve and that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$, $\gamma(1) = (1, 1)$ and $0 < \pi_2 \circ \gamma(t) < \pi_1 \circ \gamma(t) < 1$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any cyclic permutation θ of $\{0, 1, \dots, n\}$, there exist distinct points A_i , $0 \leq i \leq n+1$, on γ such that $A_0 = (0, 0)$, $A_{n+1} = (1, 1)$, and

$$\pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}}) = \pi_2(\overrightarrow{A_{\theta(i)} A_{\theta(i)+1}}) > 0 , \quad 0 \leq i \leq n . \quad (3.6)$$

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we generalize the conclusion of Proposition 3.2 to a larger class of curves. First, we remove the condition that $\pi_2 \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ be a continuous curve such that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$, $\gamma(1) = (1, 1)$, and $\gamma(t) \in \Delta$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequence of distinct points A_i , $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ such that relations (3.3) hold.*

Proof. The proof is divided into several steps.

Step 1. Given $\gamma(t) = (g(t), f(t))$, we first construct a sequence of curves $\gamma_k : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ with $\pi_2 \circ \gamma_k \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma$ uniformly. For each k , we define an increasing sequence $I_k = \{P_{i,k} \in [0, 1] : 0 \leq i \leq J_k\}$ as follows. Let $P_{0,k} = 0$. Suppose $P_{i,k}$ is defined for some $i \geq 0$. Choose $P_{i+1,k} > P_{i,k}$ such that $1/(2k) < P_{i+1,k} - P_{i,k} < 1/k$ and $f(P_{i+1,k}) \neq f(P_{j,k})$ for all $j \leq i$. This choice of $P_{i+1,k}$ is always possible except in the following two cases.

Case i) $P_{i,k} + 1/2k > 1$. In this case, we simply set $P_{i+1,k} = 1$ and $J_k = i+1$.

Case ii) f is constant on the interval $V = (P_{i,k} + 1/2k, P_{i,k} + 1/k)$ and is equal to $f(P_{j,k})$ for some $j \leq i$. In this case, let $[c, d]$ be the largest interval containing V on which f is constant. If $d = 1$, we again let $P_{i+1,k} = 1$, and we are done. Otherwise, we choose $P_{i+1,k}$ in the interval $[d, d + 1/k] \cap [d, 1]$ so that $f(P_{i+1,k}) \neq f(P_{j,k})$ for all $j \leq i$.

One continues this process until we obtain a collection $I_k = \{P_{i,k} : 0 \leq i \leq J_k\}$ with $P_{J_k,k} = 1$. We define f_k by setting:

$$f_k(t) = \left(1 - \frac{t - P_{i,k}}{P_{i+1,k} - P_{i,k}}\right) f(P_{i,k}) + \frac{t - P_{i,k}}{P_{i+1,k} - P_{i,k}} f(P_{i+1,k}), \quad t \in [P_{i,k}, P_{i+1,k}]. \quad (4.1)$$

In other words, the graph of f_k is comprised of straight segments connecting the points $(P_{i,k}, f(P_{i,k}))$ consecutively for $i = 0, \dots, J_k - 1$ by straight segments. Finally, we let $\gamma_k(t) = (g(t), f_k(t))$. Each γ_k belongs to $\mathcal{U}$ and $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma$ uniformly.

Step 2. Next, we use Proposition 3.2 to obtain, for each $k \geq 1$, a sequence $A_{ik} = \gamma_k(t_{ik})$, $i = 0, \dots, n+2$, of points on γ_k satisfying the conditions (3.3). One can derive a subsequence of γ_k (denoted again by γ_k) along which all of the sequences t_{ik} are convergent. We define $A_i = \lim \gamma_k(t_{ik})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma$ uniformly, we have $A_i \in \gamma$. Moreover, the relations (3.3) still hold for this set of limit points.

Step 3. Finally, we show that $A_i \neq A_j$ for $i \neq j$. Recall from (3.5) that

$$\pi_1(A_{ik}) - \pi_1(A_{i-1,k}) \geq \pi_1(A_{ik}) - \pi_2(A_{ik}). \quad (4.2)$$

By taking the limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\pi_1(A_i) - \pi_1(A_{i-1}) \geq \pi_1(A_i) - \pi_2(A_i) . \quad (4.3)$$

This implies that the sequence $\pi_1(A_i)$ is a non-decreasing sequence. Moreover, if $\pi_1(A_i) = \pi_1(A_{i-1})$, then $\pi_1(A_i) - \pi_2(A_i) = 0$ and so $A_i = (0, 0)$ or $A_i = (1, 1)$. In other words, there exist numbers u, v such that $A_i = (0, 0)$ for $i \leq u$, $A_i = (1, 1)$ for $i \geq v$, and A_i 's are distinct for $u \leq i \leq v$. We need to show that $u = 0$ and $v = n + 2$. If $u > 0$, then $0 = \pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_{u-1}A_u}) = \pi_2(\overrightarrow{A_uA_{u+1}})$, which implies that $\pi_2(A_{u+1}) = 0$. Since $\gamma(t) \in \Delta$ for $t \neq 0, 1$, this implies that $A_{u+1} = (0, 0)$ which is a contradiction. Similarly, one shows that $v = n + 2$. And so the A_i 's are all distinct. In fact the sequences $\pi_1(A_i)$ and $\pi_2(A_i)$ are strictly increasing sequences. $\square$

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a continuous curve such that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$, $\gamma(1) = (1, 1)$, $1 > \pi_1 \circ \gamma(t) > \pi_2 \circ \gamma(t)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. Then the same conclusion as in Proposition 4.1 holds.*

Proof. Note that if $\pi_2 \circ \gamma(t) > 0$ for $t \in (0, 1)$, then the problem is reduced to the one considered in Proposition 4.1. Thus suppose $\pi_2 \circ \gamma(t) = 0$ for some t and choose $T \in (0, 1)$ such that $\pi_2 \circ \gamma(T) = 0$ and $\pi_2 \circ \gamma(t) > 0$ for all $t \in (T, 1]$. We define a sequence γ_k as follows. Let $T_k \downarrow T$ and define a segment C_k connecting $(0, 0)$ to $\gamma(T_k)$. Let γ_k be the C_k joined with $\gamma([T_k, 1])$. For each k , by Proposition 4.1, we find a sequence A_{ik} , $i \leq n + 2$, satisfying the conditions (3.3) for γ_k . We derive a subsequence such that $A_{ik} \rightarrow A_i$, where $A_i \in [0, 1]^2$.

Next, we show that the points A_i , $i = 0, \dots, n + 2$, are distinct and are on γ . An argument similar to the one given in the proof of Proposition 4.1 implies that the sequence $\pi_1(A_i)$ is non-decreasing and there exist u, v such that $A_i = (0, 0)$ for $i \leq u$, $A_i = (1, 1)$ for $i \geq v$, and $\pi_1(A_i)$ is strictly increasing for $u \leq i \leq v$. If $v < n + 2$, then by equations (3.3) we have $\pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_{v-1}A_v}) = \pi_2(\overrightarrow{A_vA_{v+1}}) = 0$, which implies that $\pi_1(A_{v-1}) = 1$. Since $\pi_1 \circ \gamma(t) < 1$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$, we conclude that $A_{v-1} = (1, 1)$ which is a contradiction. It follows that $v = n + 2$ and in particular $0 < \pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_{n+1}A_{n+2}}) = \pi_2(A_1)$, which implies that $A_1 \neq (0, 0)$. Hence $u > 0$, and so $\pi_1(A_i)$ is increasing for $0 \leq i \leq n + 2$. This also implies that $A_i \in \gamma$ for all i , since $A_i \in \gamma \cup [0, T] \times \{0\}$ and, as we saw above, $\pi_1(A_i) > 0$ for all $i > 0$. This completes the proof of Corollary 4.2. $\square$

Now, we are ready to present the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let us define

$$T = \sup\{t \in (0, 1) : \pi_1 \circ \gamma(t) = \pi_2 \circ \gamma(t)\} . \quad (4.4)$$

If $T = 1$, then there exists a sequence A_i of points on γ such that the sequences (1.2) and (1.3) are exactly the same (no rearrangement is needed in this case).

Thus, suppose $T < 1$, and consider the curve:

$$\eta(t) = \frac{\gamma(t(1 - T) + T) - \gamma(T)}{|\gamma(1) - \gamma(T)|} , \quad t \in [0, 1] . \quad (4.5)$$

The curve $\eta : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]^2$ satisfies $\eta(0) = (0, 0)$, $\eta(1) = (1, 1)$, and $\pi_1 \circ \eta(t) \neq \pi_2 \circ \eta(t)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. First assume that $\pi_1 \circ \eta(t) > \pi_2 \circ \eta(t)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$. By Corollary 4.2, the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 holds for η and a sequence $s_i \in [0, 1]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. By taking $A_0 = (0, 0)$ and $A_{i+1} = \gamma(s_i(1-T)+T)$ for $i = 0, \dots, n$, we obtain a sequence A_i for which the sequences (1.2) and (1.3) are positive and are the same up to a rearrangement.

Finally, if $\pi_1 \circ \gamma(t) < \pi_2 \circ \eta(t)$ for all $t \in (0, 1)$, then one considers the curve

$$\bar{\eta}(t) = (\pi_2 \circ \eta(t), \pi_1 \circ \eta(t)) \quad (4.6)$$

and apply the same argument above. $\square$

The following is a direct conclusion of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $f, g : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\int_0^1 f(t)dt = \int_0^1 g(t)dt = 1$. Moreover, suppose that $0 < \int_0^a f(t)dt, \int_0^a g(t)dt < 1$ for all $a \in (0, 1)$. Then for any $n \geq 1$, there exists a sequence $t_i \in [0, 1]$, $0 \leq i \leq n+1$, with $t_0 = 0$ and $t_{n+1} = 1$ so that the sequences*

$$\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} f(t)dt > 0, \quad i = 0, \dots, n, \quad (4.7)$$

and

$$\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} g(t)dt > 0, \quad i = 0, \dots, n, \quad (4.8)$$

are the same after a rearrangement.

It is worth mentioning that Theorem 1.1 fails if one does not impose the condition $\gamma(t) \in (0, 1)^2$ for $t \in (0, 1)$. For example let $\gamma(t) = (2t, 0)$ for $t \in [0, 1/2]$ and $\gamma(t) = (1, 2t - 1)$ for $t \in [1/2, 1]$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 does not hold for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. However, based on Theorem 1.1, we have the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ be a continuous curve such that $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$ and $\gamma(1) = (1, 1)$. Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a sequence A_i , $0 \leq i \leq n+1$, of distinct points on γ such that $A_0 = (0, 0)$, $A_{n+1} = (1, 1)$, and the sequences

$$\pi_1(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}}), \quad i = 0, \dots, n, \quad (4.9)$$

and

$$\pi_2(\overrightarrow{A_i A_{i+1}}), \quad i = 0, \dots, n, \quad (4.10)$$

are the same after a rearrangement.

References

- [1] N.L. Carothers, *Real Analysis*, Cambridge University Press (2000).
- [2] T. Keleti, *The Mountain Climbers' Problem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., v 117, Number 1, Jan. 1993.